DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 437 199 PS 028 188

AUTHOR Baker, Spencer R.; Havill, Valerie L.; Victor, James B.; Roberts, Amy B.

TITLE Parental Values of Children's Personality across Race, Social Class, and Gender of Child.

PUB DATE 1999-04-00

NOTE 38p.; Paper presented at the Biennial Meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development (Albuquerque, NM, April 15-18, 1999).

PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Cultural Context; *Cultural Differences; *Parent Attitudes; *Personality Traits; Racial Differences; *Research Methodology; Sex Differences; Social Differences; *Values

IDENTIFIERS Salience

ABSTRACT

This study investigated whether the child behaviors and personality traits parents talk about frequently are also highly valued. The purpose of the study was to adapt Triandis' methodology (Triandis, Bontempo, Leung, & Hui, 1990) of assessing the importance of values across cultures to the assessment of the importance of personality characteristics that parents hold for children. It was hypothesized that what parents talk about are the behaviors and traits that are salient to them but not necessarily highly valued. Previous studies had found that descriptions of personality traits of extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and openness to experience were used more frequently in some cultures and social class groups than others. Thirty clusters of descriptors of these personality traits were presented to 50 triads of parents. The clusters were high and low markers of these dimensions of personality. The high markers provided information on cultural values, and the low markers provided information on cultural disvalues. Each triad of parents was timed to determine how fast they reached consensus on the value of the cluster. Preliminary findings indicated differences for race, class, and gender. The study did not find support for Ogbu's (1981) argument for two separate cultures within the African American population. Overall, the findings lend support to the theory that saliency may not constitute value for the personality descriptors provided by parents. (Contains 15 references.) (EV)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 437 199

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Parental Values of Children's Personality Across Race, Social Class, and Gender of Child

Spencer R. Baker
Hampton University
Hampton, VA

Valerie L. Havill
University of Georgia
Athens, GA

James B. Victor
Hampton University
Hampton, VA

Amy B. Roberts
University of Georgia
Athens, GA

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Spencer R. Baker

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

PS 028188

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to adapt Triandis' methodology (Triandis, Bontempo, Leung, & Hui, 1990) of assessing the importance of values across cultures to the assessment of the importance of personality characteristics that parents hold for children. Previous studies (Kohnstamm, Halverson, Mervielde, & Havill, 1998) found that descriptions of personality traits of Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, and Openness to Experience were used more frequently in some cultures and social class groups than in others. The hypothesis that the frequency of characteristics (saliency) mentioned is a true sign of value has not been tested. To investigate within race differences, a design was developed to meet the arguments of Ogbu (1981). Our results found little support for Ogbu's arguments but did find differences for race and gender. These are only preliminary results.

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to adapt Triandis' methodology (Triandis, Bontempo, Leung, & Hui, 1990) for assessing the importance of values across cultures to the assessment the importance that parents hold for personality characteristics of their children. The lexical hypothesis states that language will encode words and phrases that describe characteristics important to speakers of that language. Previous presentations and reports assumed that parents and teachers include in their natural language description of children characteristics, traits and behaviors that are important to them. Yet the investigators have not directly tested the hypothesis that the frequency of characteristics mentioned is a true sign of value. In previous studies (Baker, 1998; Kohnstamm, Halverson, Mervielde, & Havill, 1998; Havill, Allen, Halverson, & Kohnstamm, 1994), it was found that descriptions of certain personality traits in the hierarchical dimensions of Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, and Openness to Experience were used more frequently in some cultures and social class groups than in others. But, is this saliency a marker that the culture or social class group value these descriptions of personality traits?

Issues regarding the methodological approach to explore differences within the African American culture are evident in research literature. Several investigators (McLoyd, 1998; Ogbu, 1978, 1981, 1994; and Triandis, 1976) have discussed issues of culture and class with their perceived impact on research and methodological issues (See Victor, Dent, Carter, Halverson, & Havill 1998, pp. 172-176). Ogbu (1981) argued that African Americans represent two distinct groups and that urban "ghetto" African Americans have unique vocabulary categories and perceptions and might represent a

uniquely different culture from other groups of African Americans. Ogbu (1994) continued this theme and proposed a conceptualization of African Americans as "involuntary immigrants" whose perspective has been developed over several hundred years in opposition to oppression. Ogbu with collaborators continued research into the effects of African American's racial identity and its impact on psychological functioning, academic achievement and the misconceptions of African American child development.

Other researchers (see Fruyt, Hiel, & Buyst, 1998) have investigated gender differences in personality ratings. These gender differences have been investigated using genetic-biological and socio-cultural models. Fruyt et al. investigated gender differences in parental free descriptions of children and found that males received more low Conscientiousness descriptors than did females and fewer high Conscientiousness descriptors than females. In addition, females were found more Sociable and Dominant, whereas males were significantly more active. Although this saliency is established, whether or not the parents valued these personality traits was still in question.

This study investigated if what parents talk about frequently is also highly valued. It was hypothesized that what parents talk about are the behaviors and traits that are salient to them but not highly valued, for few parents in seven countries used descriptors such as honesty and truthfulness when discussing their children. A design for this study was developed to investigate culture and class with their perceived impact on research and methodological issues. Descriptions with both high and low frequencies obtained from both the University of Georgia and Hampton University studies were sorted to develop clusters of descriptions. Table 1 identifies the marker for the clusters of descriptors along with the clusters in the categories of the Big Five Dimensions of

personality, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Emotional Stability, and Openness to Experience. In addition, two categories are identified that were developed through previous interviews.

Triandis et al. (1990) hypothesized that if people shared a construct, at least 85% of the people would share it and it was cultural. Or if 85% of one gender shared the construct then it was gender-linked. If less than 85% of the sample shared the construct, it may be examined if it is shared by the majority of a sample, but if less than 50% of the sample shared the construct, it was not considered shared. Triandis et al. defined a cultural value as an idea that at least 50% of a culture group agrees with, and a cultural disvalue as an idea that at least 50% of a culture disagrees with. This method also provides information about the relative importance of the construct.

Using Triandis et al. (1990) methodology and cautions about obtaining the list of values from the people under study and in data collection, we presented thirty clusters of descriptors to fifty triads of parents (N=150). These clusters were high and low markers of the dimensions of personality. The high markers will provide information on cultural values and the low markers will provide information on cultural disvalues. Each triad of parents was timed to determine how fast (latency) they reach consensus on value of the cluster. According to Triandis et al (1990), the faster the triad reaches consensus, the more valued or disvalued the cluster of descriptions is for that specific culture. Preliminary descriptive data regarding the clusters to include agreement and latency to agreement are reported. This study is ongoing.

METHOD

Participants

There were 50 triads formed by 150 parents (males 53, and females 98). Parents were contacted and interviewed in various locations in Athens, Georgia, and Hampton, Virginia. Each parent was paid a minimal fee for participation with the triad. Level of education of the parents was diverse averaging just above an Associates Degree. The Georgia sample (N=12) was a European American sample of primarily middle class participants. The Hampton sample (N=38) was diverse on all demographics and was split into two groups (Hampton Lower SES, N=20, and Hampton Higher SES, N=18) based on the following procedure.

Socioeconomic Status (SES)

The Hampton sample (N=38 triads) provided information relative to their socioeconomic status. They provided information regarding their work status, the description of the work performed, education level, housing status and financial and parental support for their children. The description of work performed was translated into a Socioeconomic Index (SEI) (Nakao & Treas, 1992). The SEI is derived from the Occupational Prestige Score, education level and income based on the 1990 U. S. Census. In coordination with Robert Hauser (personal communication, 1997), Department of Sociology and Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin, a composite score was derived. Using a priori principal component analysis, a single component was derived from the subject's SEI for work status, current education level, current housing status and payment, work status and parental support. The principal component analysis provided an initial eigenvalue of 2.729 and explained almost 46% of the variance with a

Kaiser-Meyer-Olin Measure of Sampling adequacy in the acceptable range (.714). These indicators were used to develop a composite socioeconomic status variable. A mean composite score of the three members of the triad was added as a variable. The Hampton sample was divided into two groups, Lower SES and Higher SES, based on the mean composite SES score.

Procedures and Instruments

Subjects were contacted at various locations through work, personal relationships, and canvassing neighborhoods. The triads (interviews) were conducted at subjects' home, workplace, school and Hampton and Newport News Social Services. All interviews were audio or video taped for later transcribing. Subjects were provided a specific overview of the data collection procedures and purpose of the research project and completed a consent form. One member of each triad was designated as the scorekeeper and provided a score sheet. Three different lists of clusters (the 30 markers and the clusters, Table 1, listed in different order) were developed an alternately presented to the triads to randomize effect. The gender of the target child was manipulated. Each triad was told to think of a boy or a girl, 24 experimental triad groups had a male target child and 26 had a female target child. Participants were told to think of a child between 3 and 12 years of age. A Synchrotimer X-3000 stopwatch was used to measure timing of the triads.

Triad Instructions

Each triad group was provided the following instructions "Your group will look at 30 clusters of words or phrases describing personality characteristics. I will read each cluster to you aloud. We are interested in the amount of time it will take for your group

to reach consensus on the importance of the particular cluster. You will be timed from the moment you hear my last words to the time the scorekeeper places a check mark on the score sheet. We expect it to take longer to reach consensus on some clusters. If your group has not reached consensus in two minutes, we will move on to the next cluster. You will find each cluster has many elements. When you discuss each element, you should think of the common overall elements. There are three categories from which to choose: important, not important, and objectionable. Important means that you would like for a child to have these elements. Objectionable means that you do not want the child to have these elements. Not important means that you have no preference about whether the child has these elements or not."

RESULTS

In Table 2, cluster values are identified by total triads and then by the gender of the child the triads were instructed to think of. The clusters are listed in the columns for each of the three comparisons by the percentage of agreement and the time to reach consensus (latency to agreement). Mean scores are reported for each cluster. All clusters were above Triandis et al. (1990) 85% rule for a cultural or gender-linked value with the exception of active. However, active was well above 50% and still considered as a value. The importance of the clusters differed by comparison. Intelligence was ranked 1 for females but was ranked 4 for males. Assertive was considered more important for female children than for males and overall. Emotional Stability was rated more important for females than for males and overall. Honest, helpful and sociable were considered more important for males than for females. In Table 3, the disvalues are identified. Dishonest was completely agreed upon in all comparisons. Passive and unimaginative were of less

concern for males than for girls. These values and disvalues complement each other. When compared to males, it is more important for females to be assertive, intelligent and emotionally stable; and, being passive or unimaginative is more objectionable. When compared to females, it is more important for males to be honest, helpful and sociable; and being selfish was more objectionable. This finding contrasts with Fruyt et al. findings that parents provided females more descriptors for sociable than boys.

In Table 4, the three groups are compared across culture and social class on values. Overall, Hampton Lower SES had fewer 100% agreement and Hampton Higher SES had more 100% agreement and more clusters above 85% agreement. Hampton Lower SES valued intelligent and cooperative more than Georgia and Hampton Higher SES. In contrast, Hampton Lower SES valued honest and imaginative less than Georgia or Hampton Higher SES. Georgia considered faithful as more important than both than both Hampton groups. Hampton Higher SES valued assertive and responsible more highly as compared with Georgia and Hampton Lower SES. And, both Hampton groups valued religious more than Georgia.

In Table 5, dishonest was still completely agreed upon as a disvalue. Although Hampton Lower SES valued intelligent, the low markers for this category did not receive the same type of consensus. Georgia did not consider slow learner as a disvalue while both Hampton groups demonstrated support for slow learner as a disvalue. Table 6 and 7 are those clusters that were identified as not important in each of the comparisons identified in previous tables. Brave and shy clusters were consistently considered not important in all comparisons.

In Table 8 and 9, a rank ordered comparison is provided across all comparisons made at the cluster level for values and disvalues. In Table 10, the clusters have been collapsed into their Big Five categories and are compared to their frequency of use (saliency) in our free description study (Baker, 1998, Kohnstamm et al., 1998). The five categories are rank ordered based on their saliency and are compared with how the categories were valued. Extraversion descriptors were used the most during our free description in all comparisons; but, across all comparisons, Extraversion was not highly valued. Georgia valued Conscientiousness more highly than other comparisons and all groups valued Conscientiousness more highly in males. In this comparison, the low markers (disvalues) for each category are not separated from the high markers; however, in previous research, viewing both high and low markers provide clarity and are discussed in Table 11 (Slotboom, Havill, Pavlopoulos, & Fruyt, 1998).

In Table 11, the high and low markers of each category are rank-ordered by their saliency and are compared with their value. The saliency is identified separately in all comparisons. Across all comparisons, Extraversion high was the most frequently used category during the free description; but Extraversion high was not highly valued. Extraversion low was 5th in saliency but last in value and was not 50% shared. Gender differences were found for Conscientiousness high and Emotional Stability high. Conscientiousness high and Emotional Stability high were valued more highly for males than females.

Racial differences were evident. Although Georgia identified Emotional Stability high as a cultural value; neither Hampton group reached 50% shared. This was also found when investigating the frequency of parental descriptors (Baker, 1998).

Agreeableness high was more highly valued by both Hampton groups as compared to Georgia. In addition, both Hampton groups rated Agreeableness low higher as a disvalue than Georgia did. In contrast, Georgia valued Conscientiousness high more than both Hampton groups.

Overall, Extraversion had the highest frequency of use in parental free descriptions of children. But, Extraversion was valued either 4th or 5th consistently in all comparisons. Even at the high and low markers, Extraversion was valued lower than its saliency. At the cluster level, it was more important for females to be assertive, intelligent and emotionally stable, and being passive and unimaginative was more objectionable than males. There was a difference between males and females for Conscientiousness high that was identified in the saliency. Conscientiousness high was more valued in males than females and was used more frequently when describing males than females. Across race, Georgia valued Conscientiousness high and the overall category of Conscientiousness more than both Hampton groups.

At the cluster level, it was more important for males to be high in Agreeableness (honest and helpful) than females. This was consistent for total Agreeableness and Agreeableness high when the clusters were collapsed into categories. Although the differences in Agreeableness high were slight for gender, both Hampton groups valued it first compared to Georgia ranking of third. The saliency for Agreeableness was consistent with how it was valued. However, Agreeableness high was valued routinely higher than its saliency.

Discussion

This study employed Triandis et al. (1990) methodology for exploring parental values of children's personality across race, social class, and gender of child. Using parental free descriptions from previous investigations (Baker, 1998, Kohnstamm et al., 1998) and a design to study within race as well as across race and class, this study found preliminary differences for race, class and gender. This study did not find support for Ogbu (1981) argument for two separate cultures within the African American population except at the cluster level. Hampton Lower SES was different than Georgia and Hampton Higher SES for honest, intelligent, imaginative, and cooperative. No class differences were found when the clusters were collapsed into the Big Five categories. However, there were differences for race in Agreeableness high, Agreeableness low, Conscientiousness high and Emotional Stability high. And, there were gender differences for Conscientiousness high and Openness to Experience low.

Overall, these preliminary findings lends support to the theory that saliency may not constitute value for the personality descriptors provided by parents. This study is incomplete without an additional sample of European Americans to form a lower SES group for adequate comparisons.

References

Baker, S., (1998). How social and economic status moderates parent's descriptions of their children: Comparisons across race and social and economic status. Presentation at The Council for Exceptional Children Symposium on Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Exceptional Learners, Washington DC.

Havill, V. L., Allen, K., Halverson, C. F., & Kohnstamm, G. A. (1994). Parents' use of Big Five categories in their natural language descriptions of children. In G. A. Kohnstamm, C. F. Halverson, Jr., & R. P. Martin (Eds.), The developing structure of temperament and personality from infancy to adulthood. NJ: Erlbaum.

Kohnstamm, G. A., Halverson, C. F., Jr., & Martin, R. P. (Eds.). (1994). The developing structure of temperament and personality from infancy to adulthood. NJ: Erlbaum.

Kohnstamm, G. A., Halverson, C. F., Jr., Mervielde, I., & Havill, V. L. (Eds.). (1998). Parental descriptions of child personality: Developmental antecedents of the Big Five? In I. B. Weiner (Series Ed.) Personality and clinical psychology series. NJ: Erlbaum.

Kohnstamm, G. A., Halverson, C. F., Jr., Mervielde, I., & Havill, V. L. (1998). Analyzing parental free descriptions of child personality. In G. A. Kohnstamm, C. F. Halverson, Jr., I. Mervielde, & V. L. Havill, (Eds.). 1998. Parental descriptions of child personality: Developmental antecedents of the Big Five? NJ: Erlbaum.

McLoyd, V. C. (1998). Socioeconomic disadvantage and child development. American Psychologist, 53, (2), 185-204.

Nakao K. & Treas, J. (1992). The 1989 socioeconomic index of occupations: Construction from the 1989 occupational prestige scores (GSS Methodological Report No. 74). IL: General Social Survey.

Ogbu, J. U. (1978). Minority education and caste: The American system in cross-cultural perspective. NY: Academic Press.

Ogbu, J. U. (1981). Origins of human competence: A cultural ecological perspective. Child Development, 52, 413-429.

Ogbu, J. U. (1994). From cultural differences in cultural frame of reference. In R. M. Greenfield & R. R. Cocking (Eds.), Cross-cultural roots of minority child development (pp. 365-391). NJ: Erlbaum.

Slotboom, A., Havill, V. L., Pavlopoulos, V., & Fruyt, F. (1998). Developmental changes in personality descriptions of children: A cross-national comparison of parental descriptions. In G. A. Kohnstamm, C. F. Halverson, Jr., I. Mervielde, & V. L. Havill, (Eds.). 1998. Parental descriptions of child personality: Developmental antecedents of the Big Five? NJ: Erlbaum.

Triandis, H. C. (1976). Variations in black and white perceptions of the social environment. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Triandis, H. C. (1989). The self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. Psychological Review, 96, 506-520.

Triandis, H. C., Bontempo, R., Leung, K., & Hui, C. H. (1990). A method for determining cultural, demographic, and personal constructs. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 21, (3), 302-318.

Victor, J. B., Dent, H. E., Carter, B., Halverson, C. F., Jr., & Havill, V. L. (1998). How African American parents describe their children. In G. A. Kohnstamm, C. F. Halverson, Jr., I. Mervielde, & V. L. Havill, (Eds.). 1998. Parental descriptions of child personality: Developmental antecedents of the Big Five? NJ: Erlbaum.

Table 1

Personality Clusters Evaluated by Parents

Big Five Dimension	Items in Cluster
EXTRAVERSION	
Sociable	Enthusiastic, talkative, able to make friends easily, good sense of humor
Active	Energetic, always doing something, on the go, athletic, spontaneous
Assertive	A leader, likes to take charge, shows initiative, stands up for self, strong character
Passive	Meek, unassertive, follower, easily influenced
Shy	Introverted, keeps to self, reserved, distant, non-social
Inactive	Lethargic, not a risk taker, home-body, cautious
AGREEABLE	
Cooperative	Well-behaved, polite, reasonable, respectful, not argumentative, manageable
Helpful	Kind, appreciative, caring, patient, trusting, affectionate, generous
Honest	Sincere, trustworthy, truthful
Selfish	Impatient, not a good helper, self-centered, greedy, stingy
Stubborn	Hard-headed, does what he or she want, difficult, challenging
Dishonest	Mischievous, deceitful, tells lies, sneaky
CONSCIENTIOUSNESS	
Faithful	Dependable, loyal, reliable, stands up for friends
Responsible	Neat, orderly, careful, able to stay focused, attentive
Self-directed	Hard-worker, competitive, thorough, aims to do well, task oriented, self-disciplined
Unmotivated	Lack of self direction, low key, not serious, needs assurance
Unfaithful	Unreliable, not dependable, not loyal, not committed
Distractible	Doesn't finish activities, flighty, forgetful, day-dreamer

Table 1 (Continued)

Personality Clusters Evaluated by Parents

Big Five Dimension	Items in Cluster
EMOTIONAL STABILITY	
Brave	Not afraid, fearless, courageous, daring
Emotionally Stable	Calm, rarely loses temper, self-controlled, easy going, recovers quickly from stressful experience
Self-confident	Certain, convinced, self-assured, high self esteem
Emotionally Unstable	Cries a lot, pouts, whiny, moody
Insecure	Needs approval, lacks confidence, dependent, reliant
Fearful	Afraid, scared, anxious, easily frightened
OPENNESS TO EXPERIENCE	
Intelligent	Alert, a quick learner, good vocabulary, thoughtful, shows interest in learning, clever
Imaginative	Creative, curious, open-minded, observant, willing to try new activities, likes to explore
Slow Learner	Slow to learn, needs remedial work, not as successful in school as peers
Unimaginative	Lacks creativity, not open to new ideas, unobservant
STYLISH*	Sharp dresser, concerned about appearance, wants to look good all the time
RELIGIOUS*	Says prayers at night or in the morning, strong spiritual character, enjoys religious service

Note * indicates clusters of descriptions obtained from the African American natural language sample that did not appear in the European American sample's descriptions of children.

Table 2

Cluster Values by Agreement and Latency with Gender of Child Comparison (Important)

Triads (N=50)				Male Child (N=24)				Female Child (N=26)			
Cluster	%	Latency (Time)	Mean Score	Cluster	%	Latency (Time)	Mean Score	Cluster	%	Latency (Time)	Mean Score
Self-confident	100	5.11	3.00	Honest	100	1.73	3.00	Intelligent	100	4.13	3.00
Honest	98	1.70	2.96	Helpful	100	4.69	3.00	Self-confident	100	5.11	3.00
Intelligent	98	3.79	2.98	Self-confident	100	5.10	3.00	Emotionally Stable	100	19.43	3.00
Helpful	98	5.09	2.98	Intelligent	95.8	3.43	2.96	Honest	96.2	1.68	2.92
Imaginative	96	5.72	2.92	Imaginative	95.8	3.99	2.96	Assertive	96.2	5.20	2.96
Cooperative	96	11.60	2.96	Cooperative	95.8	6.80	2.96	Helpful	96.2	5.47	2.96
Emotionally Stable	96	18.58	2.92	Sociable	95.8	8.86	2.96	Imaginative	96.2	7.33	2.88
Sociable	92	13.92	2.88	Responsible	91.7	9.45	2.83	Cooperative	92.3	16.04	2.88
Assertive	92	14.02	2.88	Religious	91.7	12.65	2.92	Religious	88.5	13.56	2.73
Religious	90	15.25	2.82	Faithful	91.7	15.88	2.92	Sociable	88.5	18.59	2.81
Responsible	88	7.56	2.78	Emotionally Stable	91.7	17.65	2.83	Responsible	84.6	5.81	2.73
Faithful	88	17.09	2.82	Self-directed	87.5	17.34	2.79	Self-directed	84.6	6.42	2.81
Self-directed	86	11.66	2.80	Assertive	87.5	23.58	2.79	Faithful	84.6	18.21	2.73
Active	70	17.10	2.66	Active	70.8	16.10	2.67	Active	69.2	18.02	2.65

22

21

Table 3

Cluster Values by Agreement and Latency with Gender of Child Comparison (Objectionable)

Triads (N=50)				Male Child (N=24)				Female Child (N=26)			
Cluster	%	Latency (Time)	Mean Score	Cluster	%	Latency (Time)	Mean Score	Cluster	%	Latency (Time)	Mean Score
Dishonest	100	2.27	1.00	Dishonest	100	2.44	1.00	Dishonest	100	2.11	1.00
Unfaithful	96	5.82	1.08	Unfaithful	95.8	6.76	1.08	Unimaginative	100	10.07	1.00
Selfish	96	8.75	1.06	Selfish	95.8	7.49	1.04	Unfaithful	96.2	4.96	1.08
Unimaginative	96	9.88	1.04	Emotionally Unstable	91.7	7.35	1.13	Passive	96.2	5.34	1.04
Emotionally Unstable	94	8.31	1.08	Unimaginative	91.7	9.67	1.08	Emotionally Unstable	96.2	9.19	1.04
Unmotivated	92	13.32	1.04	Unmotivated	91.7	18.61	1.00	Selfish	96.2	9.90	1.04
Passive	86	11.96	1.16	Insecure	83.3	11.39	1.21	Unmotivated	92.3	8.44	1.08
Distractible	86	12.11	1.14	Distractible	83.3	13.27	1.17	Distractible	88.5	11.04	1.12
Insecure	86	13.00	1.16	Passive	75	19.13	1.29	Insecure	88.5	14.49	1.12
Fearful	72	18.13	1.28	Fearful	70.8	17.83	1.33	Fearful	73.1	18.41	1.23
Stubborn	68	23.14	1.36	Stubborn	66.7	21.30	1.46	Slow Learner	69.2	12.49	1.31
Slow Learner	62	16.11	1.38	Slow Learner	54.2	20.03	1.46	Stubborn	69.2	24.84	1.27
Inactive	54	26.16	1.36					Inactive	61.5	19.57	1.35

Table 4

Cluster Values by Agreement and Latency with Group Comparison (Important)

Georgia (N=12)				Hampton Higher SES (N=18)				Hampton Lower SES (N=20)			
Cluster	%	Latency (Time)	Mean Score	Cluster	%	Latency (Time)	Mean Score	Cluster	%	Latency (Time)	Mean Score
Honest	100	1.74	3.00	Honest	100	1.90	3.00	Intelligent	100	2.26	3.00
Imaginative	100	2.42	3.00	Self-confident	100	3.52	3.00	Cooperative	100	6.45	3.00
Faithful	100	2.46	3.00	Imaginative	100	3.94	3.00	Self-confident	100	7.41	3.00
Helpful	100	3.59	3.00	Responsible	100	4.97	3.00	Honest	95	1.45	2.90
Self-confident	100	3.65	3.00	Helpful	100	6.01	3.00	Helpful	95	5.17	2.95
Intelligent	100	4.02	3.00	Assertive	100	7.39	3.00	Religious	95	7.85	2.95
Emotionally Stable	91.7	7.91	2.92	Religious	100	9.65	3.00	Emotionally Stable	95	18.39	2.85
Self-directed	91.7	8.41	2.92	Cooperative	100	12.67	3.00	Imaginative	90	9.31	2.86
Assertive	91.7	12.72	2.92	Emotionally Stable	100	25.90	3.00	Sociable	90	13.03	2.80
Sociable	91.7	18.58	2.92	Intelligent	94.4	5.34	2.94	Assertive	85	20.77	2.75
Responsible	83.3	5.17	2.83	Sociable	94.4	11.81	2.94	Responsible	80	11.31	2.55
Cooperative	83.3	18.60	2.83	Self-directed	88.9	12.79	2.89	Self-directed	80	12.60	2.65
Active	66.7	15.92	2.67	Faithful	88.9	19.55	2.89	Faithful	80	23.66	2.65
Religious	66.7	36.00	2.33	Active	66.7	23.44	2.67	Active	75	12.11	2.65
								Stylish	40	23.53	2.00

Table 5

Cluster Values by Agreement and Latency with Group Comparison (Objectionable)

Georgia (N=12)				Hampton Higher SES (N=18)				Hampton Lower SES (N=20)			
Cluster	%	Latency (Time)	Mean Score	Cluster	%	Latency (Time)	Mean Score	Cluster	%	Latency (Time)	Mean Score
Dishonest	100	1.93	1.00	Dishonest	100	2.03	1.00	Dishonest	100	2.69	1.00
Unimaginative	100	11.00	1.00	Unfaithful	100	5.65	1.00	Selfish	100	13.34	1.00
Selfish	91.7	2.09	1.17	Emotionally Unstable	100	8.71	1.00	Unfaithful	95	7.19	1.10
Unfaithful	91.7	3.80	1.17	Selfish	94.4	8.08	1.06	Emotionally Unstable	95	9.11	1.05
Unmotivated	91.7	4.72	1.08	Unimaginative	94.4	8.18	1.06	Unimaginative	95	10.72	1.05
Emotionally Unstable	83.3	6.37	1.25	Unmotivated	94.4	10.86	1.06	Passive	95	11.10	1.05
Fearful	83.3	11.40	1.17	Insecure	88.9	9.18	1.11	Unmotivated	90	20.70	1.00
Distractible	83.3	11.40	1.17	Distractible	88.9	15.65	1.11	Distractible	85	9.34	1.15
Insecure	83.3	15.06	1.17	Passive	83.3	13.63	1.17	Insecure	85	15.21	1.20
Passive	75	10.88	1.33	Stubborn	77.8	23.97	1.33	Stubborn	80	22.10	1.10
				Slow Learner	72.2	14.47	1.28	Fearful	70	23.82	1.25
				Fearful	66.7	16.30	1.39	Slow Learner	65	18.17	1.35
				Inactive	66.7	24.52	1.33	Inactive	50	35.87	1.25

27

28

Table 6

Cluster Values by Agreement and Latency With Gender of Child Comparison (Not Important)

Triads (N=50)				Male Child (N=24)				Female Child (N=26)			
Cluster	%	Latency (Time)	Mean Score	Cluster	%	Latency (Time)	Mean Score	Cluster	%	Latency (Time)	Mean Score
Shy	60	18.28	1.64	Brave	70.8	20.46	2.04	Shy	53.8	19.27	1.62
Brave	56	36.05	1.94	Shy	66.7	17.19	1.67	Brave	46.2	36.60	1.92
Stylish	54	16.87	2.06	Stylish	62.5	17.05	2.17	Stylish	46.2	16.71	1.96
				Inactive	45.8	33.31	1.38				

Table 7

Cluster Values by Agreement and Latency with Group Comparison (Not Important)

Georgia (N=12)				Hampton Higher SES (N=18)				Hampton Lower SES (N=20)			
Cluster	%	Latency (Time)	Mean Score	Cluster	%	Latency (Time)	Mean Score	Cluster	%	Latency (Time)	Mean Score
Shy	83.3	16.46	1.83	Stylish	61.1	19.04	2.22	Shy	50	17.45	1.60
Stylish	75	2.53	1.92	Shy	55.6	20.41	1.56	Brave	45	47.04	1.70
Brave	75	23.16	2.08	Brave	55.6	32.44	2.11				
Inactive	58.3	12.46	1.58								
Slow Learner	58.3	15.14	1.58								
Stubborn	50.0	23.63	1.83								

Table 8

Comparison of Cluster Values (Important)

Cluster	Total	Male	Female	Georgia	Hampton Higher SES	Hampton Lower SES
Self-confident	1*	3*	2*	5*	2*	3*
Honest	2*	1*	4*	1*	1*	4*
Intelligent	3*	4*	1*	6*	10*	1*
Helpful	4*	2*	6*	4*	5*	5*
Imaginative	5*	5*	7*	2*	3*	8*
Cooperative	6*	6*	8*	12	8*	2*
Emotionally Stable	7*	11*	3*	7*	9*	7*
Sociable	8*	7*	10*	10*	11*	9*
Assertive	9*	13*	5*	9*	6*	10*
Religious	10*	9*	9*	14	7*	6*
Responsible	11*	8*	11*	11	4*	11
Faithful	12*	10*	13*	3*	13*	13
Self-directed	13*	12*	12*	8*	12*	12
Active	14	14	14	13	14	14

Note: All cultural values are 50% or above.
* - Denotes cultural values 85% or above shared.

Table 9

Comparison of Cluster Disvalues (Objectionable)

Cluster	Total	Male	Female	Georgia	Hampton Higher SES	Hampton Lower SES
Dishonest	1*	1*	1*	1*	1*	1*
Unfaithful	2*	2*	3*	4*	2*	3*
Selfish	3*	3*	6*	3*	4*	2*
Unimaginative	4*	5*	2*	2*	5*	5*
Emotionally Unstable	5*	4*	5*	6	3*	4*
Unmotivated	6*	6*	7*	5*	6*	7*
Passive	7*	9	4*	10	9	6*
Distractible	8*	8	8*	8	8*	8*
Insecure	9*	7	9*	9	7*	9*
Fearful	10	10	10	7	12	11
Stubborn	11	11	12		10	10
Slow Learner	12	12	11		11	12
Inactive	13		13		13	13

Note: Empty cells represent no agreement as a disvalue. All cultural disvalues are 50% or above shared.
* - Denotes cultural disvalues above 85% or above shared.

Table 10

Comparison of Frequency of Use with Value

Category	Total		Male		Female		Georgia		Higher SES		Lower SES	
	Salient	Value	Salient	Value	Salient	Value	Salient	Value	Salient	Value	Salient	Value
Extraversion	1	4	1	5	1	4	1	4	1	5	1	4
Agreeableness	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	1
Openness to Experience	3	2	3	3	3	1	3	2	3	1	3	2
Conscientiousness	4	3	4	2	4	3	4	1	4	3	4	3
Emotional Stability	5	5	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5

Table 11

Comparison of Frequency of Use with Value (Highs and Lows)

Category	Total		Male		Female		Georgia		Higher SES		Lower SES	
	Salient	Value	Salient	Value	Salient	Value	Salient	Value	Salient	Value	Salient	Value
Extraversion high	1	6**	1	6**	1	8**	1	8**	1	7**	1	5**
Openness to Experience high	2	1*	2	2*	2	1*	2	1*	2	2*	2	2*
Agreeableness high	3	2*	3	1*	3	2*	3	3**	3	1*	3	1*
Agreeableness low	4	5**	4	5**	4	5**	7	9**	6	4**	4	3**
Extraversion low	5	10	5	10	5	10	6	10	4	10	5	10
Conscientiousness high	6	4**	6	3**	9	7**	4	2**	5	5**	6	8**
Emotional Stability low	7	8**	7	8**	7	6**	5	6**	7	8**	7	7**
Conscientiousness low	8	3**	8	4**	6	3**	8	4**	8	3**	8	4**
Emotional Stability high	9	9**	9	7**	8	9	9	5**	9	9	9	9
Openness to Experience low	10	7**	10	9**	10	4**	10	7**	10	6**	10	6**

Note: * - Denotes cultural values (high categories) or cultural disvalue (low categories) of 85% or above shared.
** - Denotes cultural value (high categories) or cultural disvalues (low categories) of 50% but less than 85% shared.